UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,310	11/19/2001	Laurence I. Rockwell	7784-000188	7369

27572 7590 08/26/2005

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER	
PEACHES, RANDY	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2686	

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/992,310	ROCKWELL, LAURENCE I.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Randy Peaches	2686	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 July 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *20-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *20-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/28/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. ***Claims 20-39*** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huff et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,408,391 B1) in view of Monroe (U.S. Patent Number 6,392,692 B1).

Regarding ***claim 20***, Huff discloses in a mobile platform (see column 13 lines 37-62 and FIGURE 5), a security system for monitoring an onboard communication system communicating over a wireless link, which reads on claimed "intermittent link," (see column 5 lines 19-20, lines 59-64 and column 61-65), the security system comprising:

- an onboard network (100) accessible to a plurality of users, wherein the users are taught by Huff et al. to be internal and external users. See column 3 lines 2-9;
- a security server (114), which reads on claimed "intrusion detection system," connected to the onboard network (100). See FIGURE 1 column 5 lines 33-53;
- an Response Engine Module (272), which reads on claimed "onboard security management system," which resides in the said security server (114), responsive to the said server (114) for initiating an action to stop intrusion based on a set of object, which collectively called agents or missions), which reads on claimed "policies." See column 9 lines 6-17; and
- wherein, if an update is necessary, the policies being updated during the time that the intermittent link has connection. See column 8 lines 59-63.

However, Huff does not explicitly state wherein the said security system communicates with a terrestrial-based system.

Monroe teaches, as referenced by FIGURE 6 of a safety and surveillance equipment (transport installed system), residing on the said commercial vehicles, which reads on claimed "mobile network platform", the said transport installed system being interconnected via a link to the ground station or personal security unit, as disclosed in column 2 lines 46-48, 56-61, which reads on claimed "terrestrial-based network security management system."

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Huff et al. in view of Monroe in order to provide a

security monitoring system capable of being implemented on a mobile platform used to monitor and transmit intrusion information back to a terrestrial-based system.

Regarding ***claim 21***, as the combination of Huff et al. and Monroe are made, the combination according to ***claim 20***, Huff continues to disclose wherein initiating the action to stop intrusion comprises sending an alert, which reads on claimed "warning," message to the user. See column 12 lines 2-8.

Regarding ***claims 22 and 31***, as the combination of Huff et al. and Monroe are made, the combination according to ***claims 20 and 28***, Huff continues to disclose wherein initiating the action to stop intrusion comprises disconnecting the user's access to the onboard network. See column 11 lines 38-45.

Regarding ***claims 23, 30 and 36***, as the combination of Huff et al. and Monroe are made, the combination according to ***claims 20, 28 and 34***, Huff continues to disclose wherein the said Response Engine Module (272), further operates to provide an alert message when an intrusion event is detected. See column column 11 lines 45-51.

However, Huff fails to expressly teach of sending the message to a terrestrial-based system.

Monroe teaches in column 12 lines 41-52 where information is sent from the aircraft to the ground base surveillance system.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Huff et al. in view of Monroe in order to provide a security monitoring system capable of being implemented on a mobile platform used to monitor and transmit intrusion information back to a terrestrial-based system.

Regarding ***claims 24 and 37***, as the combination of Huff et al. and Monroe are made, the combination according to ***claims 20 and 34***, Huff continues to disclose wherein the Response Engine Module (272) further operates to install a network traffic blocking filter (firewall) on one of a plurality of user access points of the onboard network. See column 5 lines 36-53.

Regarding ***claim 25***, as the combination of Huff et al. and Monroe are made, the combination according to ***claim 20***, Huff fails to clearly discloses wherein to stop intrusion is directed to a specific one of a plurality of user access points of the onboard network.

Monroe continue to teach wherein the said comprehensive surveillance system is comprised wherein the said transport installed system includes a plurality of sensors, which reads on claimed "plurality of user access points", such that the said breach of security is associated with one of the said plurality of sensors and the said response is directed to said one of the plurality of sensors, as disclosed in column 16 lines 28-36.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Huff et al. in view of Monroe in order to provide a

security monitoring system capable of being implemented on a mobile platform used to monitor and transmit intrusion information back to a terrestrial-based system.

Regarding ***claims 26 and 32***, as the combination of Huff et al. and Monroe are made, the combination according to ***claims 20 and 28***, Huff continues to disclose wherein the Response Engine Module (272) maintains an indicator of a current operational state of each one of a plurality of network user access points of the onboard network. See column 12 lines 2-24.

Regarding ***claims 27 and 33***, as the combination of Huff et al. and Monroe are made, the combination according to ***claims 26 and 32***, Huff continues to disclose wherein the indicator indicates one of:

- a defensive category, which reads on claimed "normal operational state." See column 11 lines 22-32;
- a misdirection category, which reads on claimed "suspect operational state "," wherein an intrusion event is suspected. See column 11 lines 32-38, and
- a offensive category, which reads on claimed "disconnect state," in which access by a user of a specific access point on the onboard network is prevented. See column 11 lines 38-45.

Regarding ***claim 28***, Huff discloses in a mobile platform (see column 13 lines 37-62 and FIGURE 5), a security system for monitoring an onboard communication system

communicating over a wireless link, which reads on claimed "intermittent link," (see column 5 lines 19-20, lines 59-64 and column 61-65), the security system comprising:

- an onboard network (100) accessible to a plurality of users, wherein the users are taught by Huff et al. to be internal and external users. See column 3 lines 2-9;
- a security server (114), which reads on claimed "intrusion detection system," connected to the onboard network (100). See FIGURE 1 column 5 lines 33-53;
- an Response Engine Module (272), which reads on claimed "onboard security management system," which resides in the said security server (114), responsive to the said server (114) for initiating an action to address potential intrusion event (see column 11 lines 22-45)based on a set of object, which collectively called agents or missions), which reads on claimed "policies." See column 9 lines 6-17; and
- wherein, the action can be directed, disclosed by Huff et al. as a misdirection category, wherein an intrusion event is suspected. See column 11 lines 32-38,

However, Huff does not explicitly state wherein the said security system communicates with a terrestrial-based system.

Monroe teaches, as referenced by FIGURE 6 of a safety and surveillance equipment (transport installed system), residing on the said commercial vehicles, which reads on claimed "mobile network platform", the said transport installed system being interconnected via a link to the ground station or personal security unit, as disclosed in

column 2 lines 46-48, 56-61, which reads on claimed "terrestrial-based network security management system."

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Huff et al. in view of Monroe in order to provide a security monitoring system capable of being implemented on a mobile platform used to monitor and transmit intrusion information back to a terrestrial-based system.

Regarding ***claims 29, 35 and 39***, as the combination of Huff et al. and Monroe are made, the combination according to ***claims 28, 34 and 38***, Huff continues to disclose wherein if an update to a set of policies is necessary, the policies are updated during the time that the intermittent link has a connection with the terrestrial-based system. See column 8 lines 59-63.

Regarding ***claim 31***, as the combination of Huff et al. and Monroe are made, the combination according to ***claim 28***, Huff continues to disclose wherein the action comprises preventing access to the onboard network from a selected one or more of the user access points from the onboard network.

Regarding ***claims 34 and 38***, Huff discloses in a mobile platform (see column 13 lines 37-62 and FIGURE 5), a security system for monitoring an onboard communication system communicating over a wireless link, which reads on claimed "intermittent link,"

(see column 5 lines 19-20, lines 59-64 and column 61-65), the security system comprising:

- an onboard network (100) accessible to a plurality of users, wherein the users are taught by Huff et al. to be internal and external users. See column 3 lines 2-9;
- a security server (114), which reads on claimed "intrusion detection system," connected to the onboard network (100). See FIGURE 1 column 5 lines 33-53;
- an Response Engine Module (272), which reads on claimed "onboard security management system," which resides in the said security server (114), responsive to the said server (114) for initiating an action to address potential intrusion event (see column 11 lines 22-45) based on a set of objects, which collectively called agents or missions), which reads on claimed "policies." See column 9 lines 6-17. Further, the action is directed to one of the said plurality of users on the said onboard network (100). See column 11 lines 32-38; and
- wherein, the action includes, as disclosed by Huff et al. as a misdirection category, wherein an intrusion event is suspected or as a defensive category, which reads on claimed "normal operational state," where the user is notified. Additionally, the intruder can be blocked utilizing a offensive category, which reads on claimed "disconnect state," in which access by a user of a specific access point on the onboard network is prevented. See column 11 lines 38-45.

However, Huff does not explicitly state wherein the said security system communicates with a terrestrial-based system.

Monroe teaches, as referenced by FIGURE 6 of a safety and surveillance equipment (transport installed system), residing on the said commercial vehicles, which reads on claimed "mobile network platform", the said transport installed system being interconnected via a link to the ground station or personal security unit, as disclosed in column 2 lines 46-48, 56-61, which reads on claimed "terrestrial-based network security management system."

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Huff et al. in view of Monroe in order to provide a security monitoring system capable of being implemented on a mobile platform used to monitor and transmit intrusion information back to a terrestrial-based system.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to new ***claims 20-39*** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding ***claims 20-39***, based on the Examiner newly cited prior art and the above rejection, claims stand rejected.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randy Peaches whose telephone number is (571) 272-7914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Randy Peaches
August 22, 2005

CHARLES APPIAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER